

**REMARKS****I. Status of the Claims**

Claims 1-26 have been cancelled in a previous amendment.

Claim 45 has been added and the addition does not add new matter.

Claim 30 has been amended and the amendments do not add new matter.

Claims 27-45 are pending.

**II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claim 30 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for being indefinite. Applicant has amended claim 30 to recite the proper antecedent basis and respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

**III. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 27, 29-37, and 42-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as anticipated by European Patent Application 0 559 179 to Pozzobon et al. ("Pozzobon"). The Examiner contends that Pozzobon discloses all of the elements of the claims. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 27 recites that "each wheel is independently suspended on the carriage". In contrast, Pozzobon discloses a skate in which only the end wheels are independently suspended. *See, e.g.* Pozzobon, Figure 1. The central wheel is fixed and thus Pozzobon does not anticipate the present claims. Further, claims 29-37 and 42-44 depend from claim 27 and are allowable based at least on



as shown in the arrangement of Figure 1. Applicant submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to modify a simple and compact suspension arrangement in which all the wheels are independently suspended, as in Perlin, to provide an arrangement as defined in independent Claim 27 by combining Perlin with the more complicated arrangement of Pozzobon.

Further, one of ordinary skill would not consider Pozzobon when attempting to provide an improvement in which all the wheels of the skate are independently suspended. Perlin discloses arrangements where all the wheels are independently suspended and the stability of the skate is significantly greater than in arrangements where some of the wheels are not suspended at all, as in Pozzobon. Pozzobon's skate is relatively unstable as compared with one in which all the wheels are independently suspended. For example, if the central unsuspended wheel hits an object, which the front or rear wheel had previously been deflected by, the central wheel cannot deflect and, under appropriate circumstances, this leads to loss of contact of the suspended forward and rear wheels with the surface on which the skate was moving. This loss of contact does not occur in arrangements where all the wheels are independently suspended and therefore there would be no motivation for the skilled person to improve the arrangement described in Perlin by combining the teaching of Pozzobon.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Dated: March 23, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Louis J. DelJuidice

Registration No.: 47,522

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 5257

New York, New York 10150-5257

(212) 527-7700

(212) 753-6237 (Fax)

Agent For Applicant